



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/535,244	05/18/2005	Michel Pillet	AMC-001	5740
32954	7590	05/04/2006	EXAMINER	
JAMES C. LYDON 100 DAINGERFIELD ROAD SUITE 100 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			VU, HIEN D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2833	

DATE MAILED: 05/04/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/535,244	PILLET, MICHEL	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Hien D. Vu	2833	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 2, 7 and 9 are objected to because in claim 2, "the current" lacks an antecedent basis. Claim 7, line 3, the features "whose surfaces are degraded" is unclear what is being claimed. Claim 9, line 2, the feature "said seal is made by at least a fold" is unclear.

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

3. (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Japan (5380589).

The disclosure of Japan (589) provides a complete response to each and every element set forth in the claim. For example, Figs. 1-3 show two connectors 1,2 and a conductive insert 4 placed between the conductors.

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 2-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Japan (5380589) in view of Ehrler et al (355) and Clupper (742).

As to claim 2, to form the current to be greater than 1,000 A would have been obvious to one with skill in the art at the time the invention was made, since it has been

Art Unit: 2833

held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. In re Boesch, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

As to claim 3, Japan does not show the insert having at least a seal along the periphery of the insert. Clupper, Figs. 2a-3b show an insert 4 having at least a seal 8, 7a along the periphery of the insert. It would have been obvious to modify the connector of Japan by forming the insert with at least a seal, as taught by Ehrler, in order to protect the interior from the effects of the environment.

As to claims 4-6, Japan does not show the conductive foam could be copper foam, silver-plated copper foam and silver foam. Clupper, Figs. 3-5 show and see in column 6, foam 11 could be copper foam, silver-plated copper foam and silver foam. It would have been obvious to one with skill in the art to modify the insert of Japan by forming the foam to be copper foam, silver-plated copper foam and silver foam, as taught by Clupper, in order to improve electrical conductivity.

As to claim 7, Japan shows the surfaces of the conductors are degraded.

As to claims 8-9, to form the seal to be an elastomer and a fold would have been obvious of modification since such changes are old and well known in the art, in order to achieve the desire of selected material.

7. Jin et al, Burgess, Antes et al, Gorowitz et al and Mukougawa et al are cited for disclosure of electrical connector having seal means.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Hien D. Vu at telephone number 571-272-2016.

Application/Control Number: 10/535,244
Art Unit: 2833

Page 4

HV

4/29/06

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Hien Vu", written in a cursive style.

**HIEN VU
PRIMARY EXAMINER**